



VICTORIA UNIVERSITY
MELBOURNE AUSTRALIA

Development of physical and skill training drill prescription systems for elite Australian Rules football

This is the Accepted version of the following publication

Corbett, David, Bartlett, Jonathan, O'Connor, Fergus, Back, Nicole, Torres-Ronda, Lorena and Robertson, Samuel (2017) Development of physical and skill training drill prescription systems for elite Australian Rules football. *Science and Medicine in Football*, 2 (1). 51 - 57. ISSN 2473-4446

The publisher's official version can be found at
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/24733938.2017.1381344>
Note that access to this version may require subscription.

Downloaded from VU Research Repository <https://vuir.vu.edu.au/36549/>

Development of physical and skill training drill prescription systems for elite Australian Rules football

David M Corbett^{1,2}, Jonathan D Bartlett^{1,2}, Fergus O'Connor^{1,2}, Nicole
Back¹, Lorena Torres-Ronda^{1,3}, & Sam Robertson^{1,2}

¹ Institute of Sport, Exercise & Active Living (ISEAL), Victoria University, Australia

² Western Bulldogs Football Club, Footscray, Australia

³ Department of Health and Kinesiology, Exercise and Sport Nutrition Lab, Texas A&M
University, College Station, TX, USA

Corresponding author:

Associate Professor Sam Robertson, Institute of Sport, Exercise & Active Living, Victoria
University PO Box 14428, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia, 8001

Tel: +61 399 194 204

Email: sam.robertson@vu.edu.au

Total Word Count: 4219

Abstract Word Count: 247

Number of Tables: 4

Number of Figures: 0

25 **Abstract**

26 Elite team sport athletes can undertake a limited amount of training each week. Consequently,
27 designing training drills that improve both skilled and physical performance concurrently and
28 efficiently is of high importance. This study developed three training drill classification
29 systems using physical and skill-related data obtained from Australian Rules football training.
30 Forty professional male athletes from a single elite Australian Rules football club were
31 recruited for this study. All wore a 10 Hz Global Positioning System unit for six matches and
32 17 training sessions, which included a total of 35 different drills. High intensity running per
33 minute, metres per minute and high intensity running as a percentage of total distance were
34 obtained to provide a representation of each drill's physical requirements. Velocity at kick
35 (moving or stationary), time in possession (greater or less than 2 seconds) and the presence of
36 pressure was manually coded upon each kick to provide a representation of the constraints
37 relating to each training drill. For the first prescription system, two *k*-means clustering
38 algorithms were run on physical and skill data separately to identify similarities between
39 training drills. For the second system, *z*-scores were calculated for each physical and skill
40 characteristic in each training drill to compare directly with match conditions. For the third
41 system, a 'Specificity Index' was calculated using the absolute average of the pooled *z*-scores
42 for physical and skilled characteristics respectively. The three systems developed in this study
43 can be used to aid training prescription in elite Australian Rules football.

44

45 **Keywords:** GPS, training drill design, conditioning

46 **Introduction**

47 Australian Rules football (AF) is a high intensity, intermittent contact sport, characterised by
48 high cognitive and physical demands (Aughey, 2010, 2011; Boyd, Ball, & Aughey, 2013).
49 Thus, training drills should provide a sufficient and relevant stimulus from both a physical and
50 skill perspective, in order to improve or maintain conditioning (Aguilar, Botelho, Lago, Maças,
51 & Sampaio, 2012; Foran, 2001; Hoffmann Jr, Reed, Leiting, Chieh-Ying, & Stone, 2014) and
52 skilled performance (Davids, Renshaw, & Savelsbergh, 2010). Furthermore, drill prescription
53 in team sports should aim to replicate match conditions as this will likely lead to a maximal
54 transfer to skilled performance (Barris, Davids, & Farrow, 2013; Pinder, Davids, Renshaw, &
55 Araújo, 2011), and have the greatest positive impact on physical conditioning (Gamble, 2004).
56 In the research, training drills in AF have been presented as being prescribed exclusively based
57 on their physical (Loader, Montgomery, Williams, Lorenzen, & Kemp, 2012) or technical-
58 tactical requirements (Farrow, Pyne, & Gabbett, 2008). However, for a notably dynamic sport
59 such as AF (Appleby & Dawson, 2002), a combined approach considering both forms of
60 information appears warranted.

61 From a physical perspective, external load descriptors such as session duration, time
62 spent in velocity zones and total distance covered are often used to design and prescribe
63 training drills in team sports (Cummins, Orr, O'Connor, & West, 2013). Such information is
64 now readily obtainable in near real-time, through the use of wearable technologies such as
65 Global Positioning Systems (GPS) and inertial measurement units (Gastin, McLean, Spittle,
66 & Breed, 2013; Moreira, McGuigan, Arruda, Freitas, & Aoki, 2012). The use of these
67 technologies has also allowed for quantification of the physical demands of competition
68 (Cummins et al., 2013). It has been shown that elite AF players cover an average of 13.5 km
69 per match of which, approximately 33% is covered at velocities greater than 14.4 km/hr, and
70 complete an average of 2.1 high-speed efforts per minute (Johnston et al., 2012). In addition
71 to this physical workload are sport-specific technical actions such as kicks, handballs,
72 marking, tackling and bumping. Consequently, it would seem logical that both the physical

73 and skill load components of competition are systematically considered as part of training
74 prescription in order to expose players to match like training scenarios.

75 From a skill perspective, dynamical systems theories of skill acquisition have
76 identified the constraints, or the boundaries, associated with human movement (Davids,
77 Araújo, Shuttleworth, & Button, 2003; Ericsson & Lehmann, 1996). These constraints can be
78 classified as relating to the individual (i.e., the characteristics of the performer such as their
79 speed, height and weight), environment (including factors such as pressure, and characteristics
80 of the physical environment) and task (the rules and requirements of a drill) (Magill, 2011).
81 Consequently, identifying the key constraints in a given sport is vital to understanding and
82 monitoring skill acquisition.

83 The time in possession a player has with the ball prior to skill execution represents an
84 example of a task constraint in AF. In team sports when players must quickly dispose of the
85 ball, they may be more likely to select an inappropriate target and/or perceive the task as more
86 difficult (MacKenzie & Buxton, 1992; Mottet, Bootsma, Guiard, & Laurent, 1994). Similarly,
87 the level and type of pressure on the skilled performance could be considered an example of
88 an environmental constraint, as players may be more likely to make an error as they attempt
89 to make space from the opposition (Panchuk & Vickers, 2006; Vilar, Araújo, Davids, Correia,
90 & Esteves, 2013; Vilar, Araújo, Davids, & Travassos, 2012). The movement speed of a player
91 at the time of skill execution provides an example of an individual constraint, as players
92 experience less coordinated neuromuscular patterns and are more likely to miss their target in
93 kicks executed at faster running speeds (Ball, 2008). Obtaining data with respect to how
94 players respond when facing these constraints can provide enriching information in which to
95 assist with the design of training drills. It also provides a means by which the specificity of a
96 drill can be determined, by comparing directly with the conditions typically experienced in
97 competition. For the purpose of this study, specificity is defined as the necessity of a “training
98 programme to stress the systems that are involved in performing a particular activity to achieve
99 specific training adaptations” (Reilly et al., 2009, p. 275).

The aim of this study was two-fold. First, this work aimed to develop three specificity-based methods to prescribe drills, using both their physical and skilled characteristics. Second, this study aimed to determine the extent of how commonly undertaken training drills at an elite AF club reproduce the physical and skill related conditions of competition.

Methods

Participants

A convenience sample of 40 professional males from a single Australian Football League (AFL) club was used for this study (age: 23 ± 4 years, height: 187 ± 8 cm, mass: 86 ± 9 kg). All athletes were uninjured, had available GPS data for selected training drills and participated in at least one AFL match. This was to ensure that load measures were typical of an elite Australian rules footballer and thus drills could be evaluated on their physical and skill characteristics. Informed written consent was obtained from all participants, with ethical approval supplied by the institutional Human Research Ethics Committee.

Data collection

This was a cross-sectional study conducted during the 2014-2015 seasons, with data collected over a 24 week period. For skill data this included all 22 AFL regular season matches along with 17 training sessions. For physical data, this included a total of six matches performed outdoors and the same 17 training sessions. Based on this, a total of 35 training drills were included in this study. These included a combination of conditioning-based drills, match simulation and small-sided games which are commonly used by many elite AF clubs. However a number of drills specific to the game style of the AF club were also included in the analyses.

For all field drills and matches, players wore 10 Hz global positioning system units (GPS) (Optimeye S5, Catapult, Catapult Sports Ltd, Melbourne). The devices were placed on the upper back of players in either a pouch sewn into their guernsey or using a harness. Players wore the same device during each match and training session to reduce the risk of inter-unit error (Johnston, Watsford, Kelly, Pine, & Spurrs, 2014). AFL matches were divided into four

quarters, with interchanges recorded using the manufacturers' software package *Openfield* (Catapult Systems, Melbourne). This was done to ensure measures of intensity were not rendered inaccurate by including inactive time. Five physical measures were obtained from the GPS devices used in this study. These were: distance (m), metres per minute ($\text{m}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$), high intensity running distance (HIR) [distances covered at speeds $>4 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ (m)] (Coutts et al. 2010), $\text{HIR}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$ and HIR as a percentage of total distance (HIR%). For training sessions, each individual drill was exported from an overall session video file and quantified through *Openfield*.

To obtain footage for analysis of skill conditions, training sessions were recorded using two digital cameras. The first camera (Canon XA25, Canon, Japan) was operated at a height of approximately 15 m and provided a side view of all training sessions. This camera followed the player in possession of the ball, as well as players within close proximity. The second camera (Canon XA20, Canon, Japan) was placed at a height of approximately 10 m and was placed behind the goals. This camera remained fixed and provided a wide view of all players in the session to capture any information missed by the first camera. For all matches, television broadcast footage was used to undertake notational analysis.

To examine the constraints associated with each kick, notational analysis software was used (Sportscod version 10.3.3, Serial number: 47454, Sportstec Inc., Warriewood NSW). Three skill measures were collected to provide a representation of this component of the match. Firstly, time in possession was obtained using Sportscod's timer feature. This was calculated as the time between the player first gaining possession and then disposing of the ball. Based on coach consultation, two categories were heuristically chosen for use in the study. Specifically, kicks were classified based on whether they were executed in less than or longer than two seconds following the player obtaining possession of the ball. Secondly, movement speed of the player at the time of kick execution was classified as either moving or stationary. For this interpretation, 'stationary' was defined as the player kicking from either a standing position (i.e., following a mark or free kick) or at a walking pace. Any movement speed higher than walking pace was considered as 'moving'. Third, the presence of pressure

156 was defined as one or more opposition players within three metres of the athlete disposing of
157 the ball. These three constraints provided examples of task, individual and environmental
158 constraints respectively. The first and fourth author undertook coding of matches and training.
159 Inter and intra-observer agreement was almost perfect for movement speed at kick and time
160 in possession (inter-rater kappa coefficients: 0.83, 0.86, intra-rater; 0.89 and 0.89, 0.92 and
161 0.93 respectively), and was substantial for pressure (inter-rater: 0.76, intra-rater 0.89 and 0.82
162 for rater 1 and 2 respectively) (Hallgren, 2012).

163 *Statistical analysis*

164 Descriptive statistics (mean \pm standard deviation) relating to each of the five physical and
165 three skill characteristics were obtained for matches and each training drill. To determine the
166 extent to which each of the 35 drills were similar to one another, two separate *k*-means cluster
167 analyses (Jain, 2010) were undertaken for the physiological and skill characteristics
168 respectively. Prior to this, a hierarchical cluster analysis (Bridges, 1966) was undertaken for
169 each in order to identify the appropriate number of clusters for use in the analysis. The
170 between-groups linkage and mean squared Euclidian distance were used to make this
171 assessment, with the final selection chosen based on visual observation of a scree plot
172 displaying these results for 34 possible cluster sizes (Mooi & Sarstedt, 2010). For the *k*-means
173 clustering, each drill was assigned to a relevant group based on the proximity to the cluster
174 centre.

175 For the second prescription system, *z*-scores (refer to Introduction) were obtained for
176 each drill and characteristic based on their comparison with match demands. These
177 comparisons were undertaken using mean data from the six GPS and 17 skill files obtained
178 from competitive matches. To this end, this data was used to provide a representation of match
179 demands for each physical and skill characteristic (Formula 1), with match conditions set to
180 '1' (or 100%) in the formula and a drill-to-match ratio (d_{tm}) computed as the percentage of
181 match conditions attained by each drill. This system was developed specifically to show the
182 extent to which each drill represented match play with respect to its physical and skill
183 characteristics. Therefore, a positive *z*-score inferred an increased presence of a given

characteristic comparative to match conditions, with a negative value meaning a comparatively lower presence.

$$z_{\text{specificity}} = \frac{1-d_{tm}}{\sigma_{\text{drills}}} \quad (1)$$

For the third prescription system, firstly a ‘physical specificity index’ was calculated using Formula 2.

$$\text{Physical Specificity Index} = \frac{\sum |z_{\text{specificity for physical characteristics}}|}{3} \quad (2)$$

This value gave the mean number of standard deviations a drill was away from the match mean across all three physical characteristics. This process was again repeated for skill characteristics to determine a ‘skill specificity index’ using Formula 3.

$$\text{Skill Specificity Index} = \frac{\sum |z_{\text{specificity for skill characteristics}}|}{6} \quad (3)$$

Unless otherwise stated, analyses were conducted using SPSS for Windows, Version 17.0 (IBM Corporation, Somers, New York, USA) with $P < 0.05$ indicating statistical significance in a two-tailed significance test.

Results

Drill prescription system I - Cluster analysis

Visual inspection of the hierarchical cluster pre-screening revealed that five clusters were appropriate for use in both the physical and skill analysis. Physical and skill cluster centres for each of the physical and skill characteristics are presented in Table I, with drill cluster membership in Table II. Cluster 1 drills averaged speeds one and a half times that of a match,

with almost three times the amount of high-intensity running. Cluster 3 drills were characterized by the highest average metres per minute of all clusters, but with the lowest amount of high-intensity running. Clusters 2 and 5 had similar characteristics, with close to, or above match conditions in their physical characteristics respectively. Drills in Cluster 4 had the slowest disposal times, and required athletes to move the least.

This first prescription system also identified five types of drills based on their skill requirements. Cluster 1 drills had slightly more kicks performed under pressure than match conditions, but participants were slower in their disposal times and had lower kicks executed at running velocities. Drills in Cluster 2 had slower disposal times than a typical match, but had similar levels of pressure and fast velocities at kick. Drills in Cluster 3 had no kicks, as evidenced by the value of '0' for all constraints. This is because they were either conditioning or handball only drills. Cluster 4 drills had the fastest disposal times.

****INSERT Table I ABOUT HERE****

****INSERT Table II ABOUT HERE****

Drill prescription system II - z-score analysis

The standardised distance from match conditions for the physical characteristics of all drills is shown in Table III. The standardised distance from match conditions for all skill characteristics is shown in Table IV. The training drill 18 v 18 was the most specific, with z-scores for all physical and skill characteristics reported at 0.6 or lower. Tactical drills such as *Tackling drill* had the lowest physical specificity, whilst purely conditioning drills such as *4 min sub-max* more closely resembled matches in terms of movement demands.

****INSERT Table III HERE****

239

240

241

242

243 *Drill prescription system III - specificity indices*

244 The physical and skill ‘Specificity Index’ for each drill are presented in Table V. The
 245 specificity indices can be interpreted by the closer to zero, the more representative of match
 246 demands. The drill ‘18 v 18’ showed a specificity index closest to zero for both skill and
 247 physical characteristics (0.17 and 0.19 respectively), suggesting a considerable similarity to
 248 match conditions. In contrast drills without a ball (i.e., *iPod*, *Speed/Agility*, *Jackal*, *4 min sub-*
 249 *max* among others) unsurprisingly showed a lower resemblance to both the physical and skill
 250 characteristics of matches. Consequently, they showed the largest index values.

251

252 *****INSERT Table IV HERE*****

253

254 **Discussion**

255 The first aim of this study was to determine three separate systems for prescribing training in
 256 team sports, using information relating to the physical and skill demands of drills. The *k*-means
 257 clustering analysis identified five different types of drills for both their physical and skill
 258 characteristics. The *z*-score analysis quantified the specificity of training drills, by comparing
 259 both physical and skill characteristics to typical competition demands. The third method
 260 developed a Specificity Index, which determined a single value for each drill, thereby
 261 providing a method whereby practitioners can quickly assess the specificity of training drills
 262 based on their skill and physical characteristics.

263 In the first system, each of the five physical drill types can be prescribed to suit
 264 different training goals. Drills in Cluster 1 had a meterage per minute and level of high
 265 intensity running well above that of a match. Consequently, drills in this cluster such as *iPod*
 266 and *Jackal* tended to be high intensity conditioning drills, and are likely useful in building

267 players' repeat effort ability (Ade, Harley, & Bradley, 2014). Whilst Cluster 2 drills were
268 slightly below match levels for all characteristics, Cluster 5 drills showed slightly higher
269 values. Consequently, both of these drill types may provide a load similar to a match, with
270 Cluster 2 drills more desirable when a lower intensity is required (Gould & Dieffenbach,
271 2002). Drills in Cluster 4 had intensity well below that of a match, and are consequently most
272 useful in minimising physiological load (Kellmann, 2010). Drills in Cluster 4 were also of a
273 relatively low intensity, and tended to focus purely on technical skill refinement such as *Goal*
274 *kicking* and *Diagonal kicking*. It is of note that the *Speed-agility* drill was also included in this
275 cluster. This likely reflects a limitation of the measurement tools used in this study as these
276 drills would likely have greater acceleration and deceleration requirements which were not
277 included in the classification here. To further discriminate speed/agility drills from kicking-
278 based drills, this type of information could be useful to consider in future, however this would
279 require sensors additional to the GPS used in this investigation. As the validity and reliability
280 of accelerometer use for this purpose increases (Cummins et al., 2013), such technologies
281 could be incorporated, with resulting information added to improve the granularity of clusters.

282 Similarly, each of the five skill drill types could be used by coaches depending on the
283 constraints and skills they aim to improve. Cluster 1 drills had slower disposal execution times
284 and velocities at kick than a typical match, however the proportion of kicks executed under
285 pressure was higher. Consequently, drills such as *9v9 game* and *Clear space* could be selected
286 when responding to pressure is a key training objective. Drills in Cluster 2 were uniquely
287 characterized by a greater proportion of moving kicks. Consequently, drills such as *18 v 18*
288 and *3-phase footy* could be selected when disposing of the ball whilst running is a training
289 focus. Many of the drills in this cluster tended to be games based, such as *5 v 6 defensive grid*
290 and *18 v 18*. Both of these drills attempt match simulation, but did not replicate the time
291 constraints of AF matches. Consequently, the task constraints of drills could be modified so
292 as to increase their specificity index (Bennett & Davids, 1997). Cluster 4 drills had the fastest
293 disposal times, and required athletes to modify their kicks to a range of different circumstances
294 due to pressure. This included drills such as *Diagonal kick* and *Goal kicking*. Cluster 4 drills

295 were also highly constrained; with fast disposal times, faster kicks and shorter possession
296 times. Given that optimal skilled performance ensues after exposure to highly constrained
297 drills, these drills are likely to have the highest transfer to performance (Magill, 2011).
298 However, given that they are likely to possess a high cognitive load, they should also be used
299 sparingly (Farrow et al., 2008).

300 Of the three systems presented, this first approach perhaps best allows users to select
301 and design drills intuitively based on their descriptive characteristics. For example, if a drill
302 with a low physiological load is desired, but also a high proportion of high-pressure situations,
303 *Initiative square* could be determined as an appropriate solution. This system also assists users
304 to develop training sessions which improve an athlete in multiple ways. The *k*-means analyses
305 identified similarities between training drills, and consequently, if an athlete is exposed to only
306 drills in one cluster, they are unlikely to meet all the requirements needed for competition.

307 The *z*-score analysis of drills seen in the second system can be specifically used by
308 practitioners to identify the extent to which drills reflect match conditions. For example, if a
309 coach was attempting to decide between prescription of *18 v18* or *8 v 8 stoppage game*, it
310 could be noted that the former provides physical and skill-based stimuli more comparatively
311 reflective of the demands of competition. This system also allows users to evaluate their
312 training drills and identify the need for modification. In this sense, *18 v18* did not provide the
313 same level of pressure and fast disposals as a typical match. Therefore, it may be necessary to
314 manipulate the task constraints of the drill in order to make it more representative of match
315 conditions. This could include introducing rules which limit disposal times to less than 2
316 seconds or provide specific instruction to certain players to exert high pressure to their
317 teammates.

318 For the third system, both a physical and skill ‘Specificity Index’ were derived based
319 on the output from the *z*-score analysis. Unlike the *z*-score analyses, the index provides a single
320 absolute value, and therefore provides a concise insight into the properties of a drill. For
321 example, if the Skill Specificity Index for a match was 0.1, this suggests that a training drill
322 will more specifically prepare an athlete for an upcoming match from a skill perspective

compared to a value of 1.0. This system also has implications for drill modification. For example, if a match play drill is monitored under this system and returns a Specificity Index far from 0, then the drill should be examined in closer detail (potentially using the second system) to increase its specificity to match conditions.

An advantage of the three systems developed in this study is that they are able to monitor the physical and skill characteristics of training drills concurrently. Previous studies investigating a similar topic (Loader et al., 2012), have not quantified the constraints within training drills, and inferred purely ‘skill refining’ drills in the absence of physiological intensity. This previous work utilised three clusters, which included; conditioning type drills, match play drills and skill refining drills. However, each prescription system in this study suggested the trade-off between physical and skill intensity was not as clear, and drills could have a wide range of physical and skill characteristics. The cluster analysis showed a diverse range of physical and skill characteristics, whilst the z-score analysis revealed high physical loads in skill drills such as *Jackal*, on par with conditioning drills such as *iPod*. As such, monitoring drills purely on their physical or skill characteristics is likely to lead to inappropriate prescription in one or more characteristics (Farrow et al., 2008). For example, observation of only the physical characteristics of the *18 v 18* and *Boxout* drills would suggest that both are extremely similar. However, from a skill perspective, one of these drills has a higher average time in possession than the other. This prescription system allows practitioners to evaluate these drills comprehensively and make a more informed decision about the drill they wish to prescribe.

The focus of this study was to develop a method to assess the specificity of training drills to match play so as to improve the efficiency of training drill prescription. Training specifically to the demands of the sport yields the greatest improvements in performance (Aguiar et al., 2012; Al-Abood, Davids, & Bennett, 2001; Guadagnoli & Bertram, 2014), yet, no evidence exists as to how specific training is to a particular sport. To our knowledge, the approach in this study is the first to demonstrate an integrated physical-skill training prescription tool that aligns training with match play in team sports. Although training design

is likely to be coach-driven and prescribed specifically towards delivering a particular game style, it is likely that drill types and the physical-skill characteristics of each are inherent to a given squad of players. However, practitioners should aim to quantify particular game styles and align training so as to maximise game style physical and skill development.

The secondary aim of this study was to determine the extent of how commonly undertaken AF drills represent match demands. Each of the three prescription systems used in this study revealed a wide range in the specificity of training drills. As expected, skill-based drills such as *Tackling drill* and purely conditioning drills such as *Strides* did not reflect match demands. This is shown in their high z-scores across all characteristics and high specificity indices. Interestingly, even *18 v 18* (a drill which was designed to replicate match situations) showed slightly different characteristics to a typical match, with less kicks performed under pressure and fewer kicks being executed in less than two seconds. A drill such as *5 v 6 defensive grid*, on the other hand, was above a typical match in all characteristics bar pressure. These findings suggest that match-play drills may require modification to improve their specificity index.

There were limitations to this study which should be stated. Only drills which had one ball movement were used in the analysis. This meant that drills with two or greater ball movements were not analysed in this study. Different playing positions in AF are also likely to have varied physical and skill requirements. Consequently, future research may look to identify how different individuals respond to training drills, and provide a system that allows for position specific training. Further, other relevant team sport constraints, such as the prevalence of preferred/non-preferred limb and kick distance could be coded to provide a further refined prescription system in future.

Conclusions

This study adopted a three-phase approach to quantifying the physical and skill characteristics of training drills. The first phase identified five broad clusters of training drills in AF. This could be used to ensure a wide range of training drills are being prescribed, and to allow

379 coaches to quickly select training drills based on their desired physical and skill
380 characteristics. The second phase evaluated training drills based on how well each physical
381 and skill characteristic resembled match conditions. This system could be used to select
382 training drills through specific constraints of interest, and identify whether they need
383 modification due to lack of specificity. The final phase developed a physical and skill
384 Specificity Index, to identify how well training drills resembled match conditions across all
385 physical or skill characteristics. This can be used to ensure match play drills are as specific as
386 possible, and can be used in tandem with the other systems to identify the need for
387 modification. Each of these systems provide an integrated approach to training drill
388 prescription, to ensure training drills prepare athletes for both the physical and skill
389 requirements of competition.

References

- Ade, J. D., Harley, J. A., & Bradley, P. S. (2014). Physiological response, time-motion characteristics, and reproducibility of various speed-endurance drills in elite youth soccer players: small-sided games versus generic running. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, 9(3), 471-479
- Aguiar, M., Botelho, G., Lago, C., Maças, V., & Sampaio, J. (2012). A review on the effects of soccer small-sided games. *Journal of Human Kinetics*, 33, 103-113
- Al-Abood, S. A., Davids, K., & Bennett, S. J. (2001). Specificity of task constraints and effects of visual demonstrations and verbal instructions in directing learners' search during skill acquisition. *Journal of Motor Behavior*, 33(3), 295-305
- Appleby, B., & Dawson, B. (2002). Video analysis of selected game activities in Australian rules football. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 5(2), 129-142
- Aughey, R. J. (2010). Australian football player work rate: evidence of fatigue and pacing. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, 5(3), 394-405
- Aughey, R. J. (2011). Increased high-intensity activity in elite Australian football finals matches. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, 6(3), 367-379
- Ball, K. (2008). Biomechanical considerations of distance kicking in Australian Rules football. *Sports Biomechanics*, 7(1), 10-23.
- Barris, S., Davids, K., & Farrow, D. (2013). Representative learning design in springboard diving: Is dry-land training representative of a pool dive? *European Journal of Sport Science*, 13(6), 638-645
- Bennett, S., & Davids, K. (1997). The effect of task constraints on the manipulation of visual information and the implications for the specificity of learning hypothesis. *Human Movement Science*, 16(4), 379-390
- Boyd, L. J., Ball, K., & Aughey, R. J. (2013). Quantifying external load in Australian Football matches and training using accelerometers. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, 8(1), 44-51
- Bridges, C. C. (1966). Hierarchical cluster analysis. *Psychological Reports*, 18(3), 851-854.
- Cummins, C., Orr, R., O'Connor, H., & West, C. (2013). Global positioning systems (GPS) and microtechnology sensors in team sports: a systematic review. *Sports Medicine*, 43(10), 1025-1042
- Davids, K., Araújo, D., Shuttleworth, R., & Button, C. (2003). Acquiring skill in sport: a constraints led perspective. *International Journal of Computer Science in Sport*, 2(2), 31-39
- Davids, K., Renshaw, I., & Savelsbergh, G. J. P. (2010). *Motor learning in practice : a constraints-led approach*: London ; New York : Routledge, 2010. 1st ed.

- 426 Ericsson, K. A., & Lehmann, A. C. (1996). Expert and exceptional performance: Evidence of
427 maximal adaptation to task constraints. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 47(1), 273-305
- 428 Farrow, D., Pyne, D., & Gabbett, T. (2008). Skill and physiological demands of open and
429 closed training drills in Australian football. *International Journal of Sports Science
430 and Coaching*, 3(4), 489-499
- 431 Foran, B. (2001). *High-performance sports conditioning*: Human Kinetics: Champaign.
- 432 Gamble, P. (2004). A Skill-based conditioning games approach for elite rugby football
433 players. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 18(3), 491-497
- 434 Gastin, P. B., McLean, O., Spittle, M., & Breed, R. V. P (2013). Quantification of tackling
435 demands in professional Australian football using integrated wearable athlete tracking
436 technology. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 16(6), 589-593.
- 437 Gould, D., & Dieffenbach, K. (2002). Overtraining, underrecovery, and burnout in sport.
438 *Enhancing recovery: Preventing underperformance in athletes*, 25-35
- 439 Guadagnoli, M. A., & Bertram, C. P. (2014). Optimizing practice for performance under
440 pressure. *International Journal of Golf Science*, 3(2), 119-127
- 441 Hallgren, K. A. (2012). Computing inter-rater reliability for observational data: an overview
442 and tutorial. *Tutorials in Quantitative Methods for Psychology*, 8(1), 23
- 443 Hoffmann Jr, J. J., Reed, J. P., Leiting, K., Chieh-Ying, C., & Stone, M. H. (2014). Repeated
444 sprints, high intensity interval training, small sided games: theory and application to
445 field sports. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, 9(2), 352-
446 357
- 447 Jain, A. K. (2010). Data clustering: 50 years beyond *k*-means. *Pattern Recognition Letters*,
448 31(8), 651-666.
- 449 Johnston, R. J., Watsford, M., Pine, M., Spurrs, R., Murphy, A., & Pruyn, E. (2012).
450 Movement demands and match performance in professional Australian football.
451 *International Journal of Sports Medicine*, 33(2), 89-93
- 452 Johnston, R. J., Watsford, M. L., Kelly, S. J., Pine, M. J., & Spurrs, R. W. (2014). Validity
453 and interunit reliability of 10 Hz and 15 Hz GPS units for assessing athlete movement
454 demands. *The Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 28(6), 1649-1655
- 455 Kellmann, M. (2010). Preventing overtraining in athletes in high- intensity sports and
456 stress/recovery monitoring. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports*,
457 20(s2), 95-102
- 458 Loader, J., Montgomery, P. G., Williams, M. D., Lorenzen, C., & Kemp, J. G. (2012).
459 Classifying training drills based on movement demands in Australian Football.
460 *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, 7(1), 57-68

- 461 MacKenzie, I. S., & Buxton, W. (1992). Extending Fitts' law to two-dimensional tasks
462 *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*
463 (pp. 219-226): ACM.
- 464 Magill, R. A. (2011). *Motor learning and control : concepts and applications*: New York:
465 McGraw-Hill.
- 466 Mooi, E., & Sarstedt, M. (2010). *Cluster analysis*. Berlin: Springer.
- 467 Moreira, A., McGuigan, M. R., Arruda, A. F., Freitas, C. G., & Aoki, M. S. (2012). Monitoring
468 internal load parameters during simulated and official basketball matches. *The*
469 *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 26(3), 861-866
- 470 Mottet, D., Bootsma, R. J., Guiard, Y., & Laurent, M. (1994). Fitts' law in two-dimensional
471 task space. *Experimental Brain Research*, 100(1), 144-148
- 472 Panchuk, D., & Vickers, J. (2006). Gaze behaviors of goaltenders under spatial-temporal
473 constraints. *Human Movement Science*, 25(6), 733-752
- 474 Pinder, R. A., Davids, K., Renshaw, I., & Araújo, D. (2011). Representative learning design
475 and functionality of research and practice in sport. *Journal of Sport and Exercise*
476 *Psychology*, 33(1), 146-155
- 477 Reilly, T., Morris, T., & Whyte, G. (2009). The specificity of training prescription and
478 physiological assessment: A review. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 27(6), 575-589.
- 479 Vilar, L., Araújo, D., Davids, K., Correia, V., & Esteves, P. T. (2013). Spatial-temporal
480 constraints on decision-making during shooting performance in the team sport of
481 futsal. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 31(8), 840-846
- 482 Vilar, L., Araújo, D., Davids, K., & Travassos, B. (2012). Constraints on competitive
483 performance of attacker-defender dyads in team sports. *Journal of Sports Sciences*,
484 30(5), 459-469
- 485
- 486

487 Table I. Drill prescription system I - cluster centres for each characteristic

488

	1	2	3	4	5	Match
Metres per minute ($\text{m}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$)	200.4	116.4	204.1	49.0	140.5	130.5
HIR per minute ($\text{HIR}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$)	144.1	17.3	0.5	1.9	87.8	33.5
HIR as % of total distance (HIR % distance)	0.72	0.15	0.00	0.04	0.62	0.26
Kicks under no pressure (%)	0.13	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.22	0.27
Kicks under pressure (%)	0.79	0.67	0.00	0.00	0.78	0.73
Moving kicks (%)	0.38	0.66	0.00	0.69	0.74	0.61
Stationary kicks (%)	0.29	0.34	0.00	0.31	0.26	0.39
Kicks executed in < 2 sec (%)	0.17	0.31	0.00	0.68	0.74	0.49
Kicks executed in > 2 sec (%)	0.25	0.69	0.00	0.32	0.26	0.51

489 Table II. Drill prescription system I – skill and physical group membership for the 35
490 training drills included in the *k*-means cluster analyses

Physical cluster number	Physical cluster membership	Skill cluster number	Skill cluster membership
1	iPod, Jackal	1	9 v 9 game, Clear space, Corridor footy, Handball games, Tackling drill
2	18 v 18, 8 v 8 stoppage game, Anticipate turnover, Box out, Down the line/shape, Grid drill, Initiative square, Match play, Roundabout, Runaway breakdown, Shape to forwards, Shape to goal, Shape to rebound, Stoppage to forwards	2	18 v 18, 3-phase footy, 5 v 6 defensive grid, 8 v 8 stoppage game, Anticipate turnover, CBD, Centre bounce drill, Down the line/shape, Grid drill, Jackal, Kicking games A, Match play, Runaway breakdown, Shape to forwards, Shape to goal, Stoppage to forwards
3	4 min sub-max, Handball games	3	4 min sub-max, HB games, HG Bulldog ball, iPod, Speed agility, Strides
4	Diagonal kick, Goal kicking, HB games, HG bulldog ball, Speed agility, Tackling drill	4	Diagonal kick, Goal kicking, Roundabout
5	3-phase footy, 5 v 6 defensive grid, 7 v 4 keepings off, 9 v 9 game, CBD, Centre bounce drill, Clear space, Corridor footy, Down the line, Kicking games A, Strides	5	7 v 4 keepings off, Box out, Down the line, Initiative square, Shape to rebound

491

492

493 Table III. Drill prescription system II - specificity z-scores: skill and physical characteristics

Drill name	Physical characteristics			Skill characteristics		
	m·min ⁻¹	HIR·min ⁻¹	HIR/% distance	% kicks under pressure	% moving kicks	% kicks < 2 secs
18 v 18	-0.21	0.08	0.21	-0.09	0.11	-0.53
3-phase footy	-0.46	0.67	1.24	0.19	0.25	-0.72
4 min sub-max	1.89	-1.07	-1.39	-2.17	-2.11	-1.70
5 v 6 defensive grid	0.42	0.14	0.00	-0.20	0.23	0.01
7 v 4 keepings off	0.20	0.48	0.50	0.17	0.10	1.05
8 v 8 stoppage game	-0.20	-0.30	-0.32	-0.14	0.17	-0.28
9 v 9 game	0.58	1.03	0.99	-0.67	-0.80	-1.12
Anticipate turnover	-0.96	-0.60	-0.53	-0.56	-0.23	-1.04
Box out	-0.89	-0.31	-0.04	0.46	0.43	1.30
CBD	-0.26	1.27	1.90	-0.29	-0.18	-0.68
Centre bounce drill	-0.67	1.11	2.15	-0.40	0.10	-1.70
Clear space	0.11	0.25	0.26	-0.24	0.08	-1.70
Corridor footy	-0.48	0.73	1.34	0.16	0.17	-0.13
Diagonal kick	-2.02	-0.97	-1.04	-2.17	0.51	0.37
Down the line	0.07	0.29	0.33	0.25	0.25	0.17
Down the line/shape	-0.45	0.01	0.23	0.24	0.33	-0.51
Goal kicking	-1.02	-0.64	-0.58	-2.17	-0.29	1.56
Grid drill	-0.49	-0.07	0.14	-0.57	-0.16	-1.14
Handball games	2.03	-0.36	-0.24	0.83	-0.37	0.09
HB games	-1.90	-0.84	-0.66	-2.17	-2.11	-1.70
HG Bulldog ball	-1.45	0.09	1.30	-2.17	-2.11	-1.70
Initiative square	-0.68	-0.04	0.30	0.23	1.27	1.65
iPod	1.80	3.60	2.53	-2.17	-2.11	-1.70
Jackal	1.45	2.71	2.00	-0.10	0.19	-0.78
Kicking games A	0.37	0.33	0.24	-0.14	-0.08	-0.68
Match play	-1.08	-0.12	0.45	0.11	-0.37	-0.09
Roundabout	-0.35	-0.52	-0.59	-2.17	0.65	0.29
Runaway breakdown	-0.64	-0.29	-0.13	-0.07	0.70	-0.48
Shape to forwards	-0.38	0.34	0.62	-0.03	0.38	-0.62
Shape to goal	-0.56	0.22	0.63	-0.67	0.87	-1.70
Shape to rebound	-0.80	-0.22	0.07	-0.27	0.19	0.46
Speed agility	-1.10	-0.99	-1.21	-2.17	-2.11	-1.70
Stoppage to forwards	-0.76	0.03	0.47	-0.22	0.40	-0.12
Strides	0.26	1.77	2.02	-2.17	-2.11	-1.70
Tackling drill	-2.08	-1.02	-1.19	0.83	-2.11	-1.70

Drill prescription for Australian Rules football

494 Notes: HIR is high intensity running, $\text{m}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$ is metres per minute

495

496 Table IV. Drill prescription system III - specificity indices

Physical	Specificity Index	Skill
18 v 18; 5 v 6 Defensive grid	0.1 - 0.2	18 v 18; 5 v 6 defensive grid; Corridor footy
Clear space; Down the line; Down the line/shape; Grid drill; 8 v 8 stoppage game	>0.2 - 0.3	8 v 8 stoppage game; Down the line; Stoppage to forwards
Kicking games A; Initiative square; Runaway breakdown; Shape to rebound; 7v4 keepings off	>0.3 - 0.4	Kicking games A; Shape to rebound; Shape to forwards; Down the line/shape; Jackal; CBD; 3-phase footy
Box out; Stoppage to forwards; Shape to forwards; Shape to goal; Roundabout	>0.4 - 0.5	Runaway breakdown; Handball games; 7 v 4 keepings off
	>0.5 - 0.6	Anticipate turnover; Grid drill; Clear space
	>0.6 - 0.7	Anticipate turnover; Grid drill; Clear space
Anticipate turnover; Goal kicking; 3-phase footy	>0.7 - 0.8	Box out; Centre bounce drill
Corridor footy; 9 v 9 game; Handball games	>0.8 - 0.9	9 v 9 game
HG Bulldog ball	>0.9 - 1.1	Diagonal kick; Roundabout; Shape to goal
Speed agility; HB games; CBD; Centre bounce drill; Diagonal kick; Strides; Tackling drill; 4 min sub-max	>1.1 - 1.5	
	>1.5 - 2	Tackling drill; 4 min sub-max; HB games; HG Bulldog ball; iPod; Speed agility; Strides
Jackal; iPod	>2	

497

498

499

500

501

502